

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22, 27 and 28 are currently pending in the present patent application. Claims 9-12 and 23-26 have been cancelled through the above claim amendments. Note that the originally filed claims included claims 1-22 and then skipped claim numbers 23 and 24, with the last two claims being numbered 25 and 26. Thus, only 24 claims were originally filed in the application (*i.e.*, claim 1-22, 25 and 26). Accordingly, claims 23-26 were cancelled through the above amendments and new claims 27 and 28, which correspond to original claims numbered 25 and 26, were added to clarify the numbering of the presently pending claims.

In Sections 1 and 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. The claims have been amended pursuant to the Examiner's comments and are now in compliance with Section 101.

Under Sections 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,511,116 to Shastry *et al.* ("Shastry").

Claim 1 recites a method of deploying a telecommunications service where the service is implemented in a service graph formed from a plurality of service independent building blocks. The method includes, under control of a client system, developing the service graph including a plurality of service independent building blocks interconnected to execute a service process. From the service graph a service script is generated and the service script is transferred to a computer-readable medium. The service script is transferred from the computer-readable medium to a server system, and under control of the server system, the service script is compiled to generate a service image and the service image is executed on the server system.

The Examiner has not shown the Shastry discloses or suggests developing a service graph including a plurality of service independent building blocks interconnected to execute a service process and generating a service script from the service graph, with the service graph then being transferred to a computer-readable medium from this medium to a server system. None of the sections of Shastry cited by the Examiner disclose such a service script. The combination of elements recited in claim 1 is accordingly allowable.

Dependent claims 2 and 3 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and due to the additional limitations added by each of these dependent claims.

Independent claim 4 and dependent claims 5-8 are allowable for reasons similar to those just described for claim 1.

Independent claim 13 recites a computer-readable storage medium including a service script generated from a service graph including a plurality of interconnected service independent building blocks. The service script is used to cause a computer system to execute a telecommunications service. Once again, the Examiner has not shown that Shastri discloses nor suggests such a service script. Accordingly, the combination of elements recited in claim 13 is allowable. Dependent claims 14 and 15 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13 and due to the additional limitations added by each of these dependent claims.

Independent claim 16, 19 and 22 are allowable for reasons similar to those just described for claims 1 and 13. All dependent claims not expressly discussed above are allowable for at least the same reasons as the associated independent claim and due to the additional limitations added by each of these dependent claims.

The undersigned understands that the USPTO has adopted an interim policy, in effect while courts decide the issue, wherein a signal containing computer instructions is regarded to be non-statutory subject matter. To comply with the Examiner's rejection under this policy and further prosecution on the merits, the undersigned has complied with the Examiner's corresponding rejections and amended claims 9-12 pursuant to the Examiner's rejections of these claims. The pending claims should be regarded, however, as reading on the entire breadth of corresponding computer-readable media and equivalents, such as propagated signals or carrier wave signals, as may be determined statutory by the courts and/or legislative action.

\

\

\

\

The present patent application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner consider any of the claims not in condition for allowance, the undersigned requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at (425) 455-5575 to arrange for a telephone interview to discuss the outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Paul F. Rusyn". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Paul" being the most prominent.

Paul F. Rusyn
Registration No. 42,118
155 – 108th Avenue NE, Suite 350
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973
(425) 455-5575 Phone
(425) 455-5575 Fax

Correspondence to:
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Phone: (970) 898-3884